



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,579	12/06/2000	James G. Hanko	007056-0127/P5556/BBC	3283
23600	7590	03/17/2004		
COUDERT BROTHERS LLP 333 SOUTH HOPE STREET 23RD FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90071			EXAMINER BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R	
			ART UNIT 2155	PAPER NUMBER 7

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/733,579

Applicant(s)

HANKO ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin R Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Application/Control Number: 09/733,579
Art Unit: 2155

Page 2

Detailed Action

Claims 1-18 are pending in this Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on paper 6 has been considered.

Formal Drawings

The formal drawings received on 4/2/01 have been entered.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words and is found on two pages, 29 and 30. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said second client" in claim 1, line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,408,600 by Garfinkel et al (Applicant IDS).

Claims 1, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,408,600 by Garfinkel et al (Applicant IDS).

Regarding claim 1, a method for associating multiple display units in a grouped server environment (col. 2, lines 10-25; col. 3, lines 41-42) comprising:

identifying when an event occurs that is associated with a secondary device (col. 4, lines 24-25, 49-51);

determining whether a primary device associated with said secondary device has an associated active session (col. 4, lines 59-62); and

performing an action, if said primary device does have said associated active session (col. 4, lines 62-65).

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 5, the method of claim 1 wherein said primary and secondary devices are human interface devices (col. 4, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 6, the method of claim 1 wherein said first and second locations are servers (col. 3, lines 41-42).

Claims 7, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,408,600 by Garfinkel et al (Applicant IDS).

Regarding claim 7, a grouped server environment having multiple associated display units (col. 2, lines 10-25; col. 3, lines 41-42) comprising:

- an event associated with a secondary device configured to be identified (col. 4, lines 24-25, 49-51);

- a determiner configured to determine whether a primary, device associated with said secondary device has an associated active session (col. 4, lines 59-62); and

- an action configured to be performed, if said primary device does have said associated active session (col. 4, lines 62-65).

Regarding claim 11, the grouped server environment of claim 7 wherein said primary and secondary devices are human interface devices (col. 4, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 12, the grouped server environment of claim 7 wherein said first and second locations are servers (col. 3, lines 41-42).

Claims 13, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,408,600 by Garfinkel et al (Applicant IDS).

Regarding claim 13, a computer program product (col. 3, lines 5-9) comprising:

- a computer usable medium having computer readable program code embodied therein configured for associating multiple display units in a grouped server environment (col. 3, lines 5-9; col. 2, lines 10-25; col. 3, lines 41-42), comprising:

- computer readable code configured to cause a computer to identify when an event occurs that is associated with a secondary device (col. 4, lines 24-25, 49-51);

- computer readable code configured to cause a computer to determine whether a primary device associated with said secondary device has an associated active session (col. 4, lines 59-62); and

- computer readable code configured to cause a computer to perform an action, if said primary device does have said associated active session (col. 4, lines 62-65).

Regarding claim 17, the computer program product of claim 13 wherein said primary and secondary devices are human interface devices (col. 4, lines 49-54).

Regarding claim 18, the computer program product of claim 13 wherein said first and second locations are servers (col. 3, lines 41-42).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 8-10, 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,408,600 by Garfinkel et al (Applicant IDS) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,333 by Jawahar et al.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,408,600 by Garfinkel et al (Applicant IDS) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,333 by Jawahar et al.

Regarding claim 2,

The Garfinkel reference teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein said action comprises: determining a first location for said active session (col. 4, lines 58-65; determine if connection made from local computer);

determining, a second location, for a connection for said secondary device (col. 4, lines 58-65; connection to remote display).

The Garfinkel reference does not explicitly state determining whether said first and second locations are the same location.

The Jawahar reference teaches determining whether said first and second locations are the same location (col. 21, lines 30-37; customer client is the session host).

The Jawahar reference further teaches the system of collaboration overcomes tedious and time-consuming tasks using logging accesses and identity of resources of searched information (col. 1, lines 40-62).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of determining a first location for an active session and a second location for a secondary device as taught by Garfinkel while determining if first and second locations are the same as taught by Jawahar in order to overcomes tedious and time-consuming tasks (col. 1, lines 40-62).

Application/Control Number: 09/733,579
Art Unit: 2155

Page 6

Claims 3, 4 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Garfinkel et al and Jawahar et al.

Regarding claim 3, the method of claim 2 further comprising:

redirecting said connection to said first location, if said first and second locations are not the same location (Jawahar: col. 21, lines 31-51; redirected to the session host).

Regarding claim 4, the method of claim 3 further comprising:

augmenting said active session to indicate that said first and second locations are the same location (Jawahar: col. 21, lines 31-52; augmenting is modifying the URL concatenating with the identity of the session host).

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,408,600 by Garfinkel et al (Applicant IDS) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,333 by Jawahar et al.

Regarding claim 8,

The Garfinkel reference teaches a grouped server environment of claim 7 wherein said action comprises:

a first location for said active session configured to be determined (col. 4, lines 58-65; determine if connection made from local computer);

a second location for a connection for said secondary device configured to be determined (col. 4, lines 58-65; connection to remote display).

The Garfinkel reference does not explicitly state using an identifier to determine whether said first and second locations are the same location.

The Jawahar reference teaches an identifier determining whether said first and second locations are the same location (col. 21, lines 30-37; customer client is the session host).

The Jawahar reference further teaches the system of collaboration overcomes tedious and time-consuming tasks using logging accesses and identity of resources of searched information (col. 1, lines 40-62).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the group server environment that determines a first location for an active session and a second location for a secondary device as taught by Garfinkel while using an identifier to determine if first and second locations are the same as taught by Jawahar in order to overcomes tedious and time-consuming tasks (col. 1, lines 40-62).

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Garfinkel et al and Jawahar et al.

Regarding claim 9, the grouped server environment of claim 8 further comprising:

a redirector configured to redirect said connection to said first location, if said first and second locations are not the same location (Jawahar: col. 21, lines 31-51; redirected to the session host).

Regarding claim 10, the grouped server environment of claim 9, further comprising:
an indicator configured to augment said active session to indicate that said first and second locations are the same location (Jawahar: col. 21, lines 31-52; augmenting is modifying the URL concatenating with the identity of the session host).

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,408,600 by Garfinkel et al (Applicant IDS) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,333 by Jawahar et al.

Regarding claim 14,

The Garfinkel reference teaches the computer program product of claim 13 wherein said computer readable code configured to cause a computer to perform an action comprises:

computer readable code configured to cause a computer to determine a first location for said active session (col. 4, lines 58-65; determine if connection made from local computer);

computer readable code configured to cause a computer to determine a second location for a connection for said secondary device (col. 4, lines 58-65; connection to remote display).

The Garfinkel reference does not explicitly disclose computer readable code configured to cause a computer to determine whether said first and second locations are the same location.

The Jawahar reference teaches computer readable code configured to cause a computer to determine whether said first and second locations are the same location (col. 21, lines 30-37; customer client is the session host).

The Jawahar reference further teaches the system of collaboration overcomes tedious and time-consuming tasks using logging accesses and identity of resources of searched information (col. 1, lines 40-62).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the computer program product that determines a first location for an active session and a second location for a secondary device as taught by Garfinkel while using determining if first and second locations are the same as taught by Jawahar in order to overcomes tedious and time-consuming tasks (col. 1, lines 40-62).

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Garfinkel et al and Jawahar et al.

Regarding claim 15, the computer program product of claim 14 further comprising:

computer readable code configured to cause a computer to redirect said connection to said first location, if said first and second locations are not the same location (Jawahar: col. 21, lines 31-51; redirected to the session host).

Application/Control Number: 09/733,579
Art Unit: 2155

Page 8

Regarding claim 16, the computer program product of claim 15 further comprising:
computer readable code configured to cause a computer to augment said active session to indicate that said first and second locations are the same location (Jawahar: col. 21, lines 31-52; augmenting is modifying the URL concatenating with the identity of the session host).

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent No. 6,662,224 issued to Angwin et al.

U. S. Patent No. 6,269,402 issued to Lin et al

U. S. Patent No. 5,313,582 issued to Giokas et al

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155
brb
March 10, 2004

BRB

Hosain Alam
HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER